

**SUBREPRESENTATIONS IN THE POLYNOMIAL
REPRESENTATION OF THE DOUBLE AFFINE HECKE
ALGEBRA OF TYPE GL_n AT $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$**

MASAHIRO KASATANI

ABSTRACT. We study a Laurent polynomial representation V of the double affine Hecke algebra of type GL_n for specialized parameters $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$. We define a series of subrepresentations of V by using a vanishing condition. For some cases, we give an explicit basis of the subrepresentation in terms of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. These results are nonsymmetric versions of [7] and [9].

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1990's, Cherednik introduced the double affine Hecke algebra [1]. In terms of the polynomial representation of the algebra, Macdonald's conjecture was solved in [2], [3] for reduced root systems (and in [12],[13] for non-reduced $(C^\vee, C)$ case). For the root system of type A , a classification of irreducible representations of a certain class is given in [5], [14], [15]. In [6], it is shown that finite-dimensional quotients of the polynomial representation by the kernel of some degenerate bilinear form are irreducible.

The double affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$ of type GL_n is an associative algebra with two parameters t, q generated by X_i, Y_i and T_j ($1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n-1$) with some relations. The algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$ has a basic representation U on the ring of n -variable Laurent polynomials. The representation U is irreducible and Y -semisimple, namely the operators Y_i are simultaneously diagonalizable on U . The nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial is defined to be a monic simultaneous eigenvector for Y_i .

In this paper, we specialize the parameters at $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $2 \leq r$. To be precise, introduce a new parameter u and specialize

$$(1) \quad (t, q) = (u^{(r-1)/M}, \tau u^{-(k+1)/M}).$$

Here, M is the greatest common divisor of $(k+1, r-1)$ and $\tau = \exp(\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{r-1})$. We denote by $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$ and V , the corresponding algebra and its polynomial representation. The representation V can have subrepresentations and they may not be Y -semisimple.

In [7] and [9], a series of ideals in the ring of symmetric polynomials with n -variables are defined by vanishing conditions, and explicit bases of the ideals are

given in terms of symmetric Macdonald polynomials specialized at (1). The vanishing conditions for symmetric polynomial f are as follows. Fix $m \geq 1$.

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \quad \text{if } x_{i_{l,a+1}} = x_{i_{l,a}} t q^{s_{l,a}} \quad (1 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq a \leq k)$$

where $i_{l,a}$ are distinct, $s_{j,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\sum_{i=1}^k s_{j,i} \leq r-1$.

This is called the *wheel condition* for symmetric case. In the case $m = 1$, the basis of the ideal is given in [7] by Macdonald polynomials P_λ specialized at (1) with partitions λ satisfying $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+k} \geq r$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-k$. In the case $(k, r, m) = (1, 2, 2)$, the basis of the ideal is given in [9] by linear combinations of Macdonald polynomials at (1). Also, a similar ideal in the ring of BC -symmetric Laurent polynomials is investigated in [8].

These ideals are invariant under the multiplication by symmetric polynomials and Macdonald's q -difference operators. The former actions are symmetric polynomials of X_i and the latter actions are symmetric polynomials of Y_i . Moreover, the action of T_i on any symmetric polynomial is a multiplication by a scalar. Hence the ideals are representations of the subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$ generated by $\{\mathbb{C}(u)[X_1, \dots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}, \mathbb{C}(u)[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}, T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}\}$.

In this paper, we consider a nonsymmetric version of these ideals. In other words, we construct a finite series of subrepresentations in V of the whole algebra $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$. In order to obtain them, we define a vanishing condition as follows. Fix $m \geq 1$.

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} &f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \quad \text{if } x_{i_{l,a+1}} = x_{i_{l,a}} t q^{s_{l,a}} \quad (1 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq a \leq k) \\ &\text{where } i_{l,a} \text{ are distinct, } s_{l,a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \\ &\sum_{i=1}^k s_{l,a} \leq r-2, \text{ and } i_{l,a} < i_{l,a+1} \text{ if } s_{l,a} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We call the vanishing condition (2) the *wheel condition* for nonsymmetric case. Denote by $I_m^{(k,r)}$ the space of Laurent polynomials satisfying the wheel condition (2).

Let us state the main theorem in this paper. Define $B^{(k,r)} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n; \text{ for any } 1 \leq a \leq n-k, \lambda_{i_a} - \lambda_{i_{a+k}} \geq r, \text{ or } \lambda_{i_a} - \lambda_{i_{a+k}} = r-1 \text{ and } i_a < i_{a+k}\}$. Here, we determine the index $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w \cdot (1, \dots, n)$ using the shortest element $w \in W = \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\lambda = w \cdot \lambda^+$ where λ^+ is the dominant element in the orbit $W\lambda$. The result is

Theorem 1.1. *The ideal $I_1^{(k,r)}$ is an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$ and it is Y -semisimple. For any $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at (1). Moreover, a basis of the ideal $I_1^{(k,r)}$ is given by $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in B^{(k,r)}\}$ specialized at (1).*

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we first show that these polynomials have no pole at (1) and they satisfy the wheel condition if they are specialized at (1). We use the duality relation for nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials (see (3) in Proposition 2.2) and we count the order of poles and zeros in order to check the statement. This gives a lower estimate of the character of the ideal.

Next, we give an upper estimate of the character of the ideal. We introduce the filtration $V_{(M)} = \text{span}\{x^\lambda; \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n, |\lambda_i| \leq M\}$ and define a non-degenerate pairing

between $V_{(M)}$ and the n -th tensor space $R_{M,n} = (\text{span}\{e_d; -M \leq d \leq M\})^{\otimes n}$. We give a spanning set of the quotient space of $R_{M,n}$ which has the same character as $I_1^{(k,r)} \cap V_{(M)}$.

Finally, we show irreducibility by using intertwining operators. These operators send one eigenvector to another eigenvector. We show that E_λ for any $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$ is a cyclic vector of $I_1^{(k,r)}$.

For the case $n = k + 1$, we also show that $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ is irreducible and we give an explicit basis of $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$. We expect that all subquotients $I_m^{(k,r)}/I_{m-1}^{(k,r)}$ of the series are irreducible.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review the double affine Hecke algebra, the polynomial representation U , the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials E_λ , and intertwiners. In Section 3, we state the wheel condition and show that it determines a subrepresentation $I_1^{(k,r)}$. In Section 4, we give a lower estimate of the character of $I_1^{(k,r)}$ using nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. In Section 5, we give an upper estimate of the character of $I_1^{(k,r)}$, and we show that $I_1^{(k,r)}$ is irreducible. In Section 6, we define a (finite) series of subrepresentations $I_m^{(k,r)}$ by the wheel condition. The series contains the irreducible representation $I_1^{(k,r)}$ defined in Section 3. We also treat the case $n = k + 1$ in Section 6.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Ivan Cherednik for a useful discussion which leads him to this study. The author also thanks his adviser Tetsuji Miwa for giving many comments to the manuscript.

2. DOUBLE AFFINE HECKE ALGEBRA AND NONSYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we review the double affine Hecke algebra of type GL_n , nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials, and intertwiners. For more details, see, e.g., [4]. In this paper, we follow the notation in [11].

2.1. Double affine Hecke algebra of type GL_n . Let $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}$ be the field $\mathbb{C}(t^{1/2}, q)$.

Definition 2.1. The double affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$ of type GL_n is an associative $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}$ -algebra generated by

$$\langle X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}, Y_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, Y_n^{\pm 1}, T_1, \dots, T_{n-1} \rangle$$

satisfying the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
& X_i^{\pm 1} \text{ are mutually commutative and } X_i X_i^{-1} = 1, \\
& Y_i^{\pm 1} \text{ are mutually commutative and } Y_i Y_i^{-1} = 1, \\
& (T_i - t^{1/2})(T_i + t^{-1/2}) = 0, \\
& T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}, \\
& T_i T_j = T_j T_i \quad (|i - j| \geq 2), \\
& T_i X_i T_i = X_{i+1}, \\
& T_i X_j = X_j T_i \quad (j \neq i, i+1), \\
& T_i^{-1} Y_i T_i^{-1} = Y_{i+1}, \\
& T_i Y_j = Y_j T_i \quad (j \neq i, i+1), \\
& Y_2^{-1} X_1 Y_2 X_1^{-1} = T_1^2, \\
& Y_i \tilde{X} = q \tilde{X} Y_i \quad \text{where } \tilde{X} = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i, \\
& X_i \tilde{Y} = q^{-1} \tilde{Y} X_i \quad \text{where } \tilde{Y} = \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i.
\end{aligned}$$

2.2. Polynomial representation. The algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$ has a basic representation on the ring of Laurent polynomials $U = \tilde{\mathbb{K}}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_n^{\pm 1}]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
X_i & \mapsto x_i, \\
T_i & \mapsto t^{1/2} s_i + \frac{t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}}{x_i/x_{i+1} - 1} (s_i - 1), \\
Y_i & \mapsto T_i T_{i+1} \cdots T_{n-1} \omega T_1^{-1} T_2^{-1} \cdots T_{i-1}^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, s_i is the permutation of the variables x_i and x_{i+1} , $\omega = s_{n-1} \cdots s_1 \tau_1$, and $\tau_i x_j = q^{\delta_{ij}} x_j$. Namely, $\omega f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = f(qx_n, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1})$ for any $f \in U$.

2.3. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials E_λ . The representation U is semisimple with respect to the action of $\{Y_i\}$ and it has simultaneous eigenvectors labeled by $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We call such eigenvectors *Y-eigenvectors*. The monic *Y-eigenvectors* are called nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. To describe eigenvalues, we use the following notations.

Denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ by $\{\epsilon_i\}$. We identify the weight lattice P of type GL_n with $\mathbb{Z}^n$. For $\lambda \in P$, let us denote by λ_i the i -th component of λ . Let $\Delta_+ = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j; i < j\}$ be the set of positive roots for A_{n-1} and $W = \mathfrak{S}_n$ the Weyl group. Set $P^+ = \{\lambda \in P; \langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for any } i\}$ and write the dominant element $\lambda^+ \in P^+ \cap W\lambda$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \alpha = \left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n-3}{2}, \dots, -\frac{n-1}{2} \right), \\
\rho(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} \chi(\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle) \alpha, \\
\chi(a) &= \begin{cases} +1 & (a \geq 0) \\ -1 & (a < 0) \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

The element $\rho(\lambda)$ is equal to $w_\lambda \rho$ where $w_\lambda \in W$ is the shortest element such that $\lambda = w_\lambda \lambda^+$. Note that $\rho(\lambda)_i > \rho(\lambda)_j$ if $(\lambda_i > \lambda_j)$ or $(\lambda_i = \lambda_j \text{ and } i < j)$.

We define the ordering $\succ$ by $\lambda \succ \mu \Leftrightarrow (\lambda^+ > \mu^+)$ or $(\lambda^+ = \mu^+ \text{ and } \lambda > \mu)$. Here $>$ is the dominance ordering: $\lambda \geq \mu \Leftrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_j$ for any $1 \leq l \leq n$. The operator Y_i is triangular with respect to the ordering $\succ$:

$$Y_i x^\lambda = t^{\rho(\lambda)_i} q^{\lambda_i} x^\lambda + \sum_{\mu \prec \lambda} c_{\lambda, \mu} x^\mu.$$

We write $f(t^{\pm \rho(\lambda)} q^{\pm \lambda}) = f(t^{\pm \rho(\lambda)_1} q^{\pm \lambda_1}, \dots, t^{\pm \rho(\lambda)_n} q^{\pm \lambda_n})$. The nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ is defined to be the monic Y -eigenvector:

$$\begin{aligned} f(Y)E_\lambda &= f(t^{\rho(\lambda)} q^\lambda)E_\lambda \quad \text{for any } f \in U, \\ E_\lambda &= x^\lambda + \sum_{\mu \prec \lambda} c_{\lambda, \mu} x^\mu. \end{aligned}$$

The nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials form a basis of U .

2.4. Duality relation. For any $\lambda \in P$ and $f \in U$, we use the notation

$$u_\lambda(f) = f(t^{-\rho(\lambda)} q^{-\lambda}).$$

For example, $u_\lambda(x_i) = t^{-\rho(\lambda)_i} q^{-\lambda_i}$.

Proposition 2.2 (duality[4]). *Two nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials E_λ and E_μ satisfy the following relation.*

$$(3) \quad \frac{u_\mu(E_\lambda)}{u_0(E_\lambda)} = \frac{u_\lambda(E_\mu)}{u_0(E_\mu)}.$$

2.5. Recurrence formulas for $u_0(E_\lambda)$. We have the following recurrence formulas for $u_0(E_\lambda) = E_\lambda(t^{-\rho})$.

Lemma 2.3. *We write $\omega\lambda = (\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n, \lambda_1 + 1)$. Then we have*

$$u_0(E_{\omega\lambda}) = u_0(E_\lambda) \cdot t^{\rho(\lambda)_1}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $\lambda \prec s_i \lambda$ (namely, $\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle < 0$). Then we have*

$$u_0(E_{s_i \lambda}) = u_0(E_\lambda) \cdot t^{-1} \frac{t u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1}{u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1}.$$

2.6. Intertwiners. There exist some operators which create $E_{\omega\lambda}$ and $E_{s_i \lambda}$ from E_λ . In other words, they intertwine the eigenvectors. This is due to Cherednik (see e.g. [4]). Especially for GL_n case, see also [10] and [11].

Lemma 2.5 (operator A). *We set $\omega = (T_1 \cdots T_{n-1})^{-1} Y_1$ and $A = \omega X_1$. Then we have,*

$$A E_\lambda = q^{\lambda_1 + 1} E_{\omega\lambda}.$$

Lemma 2.6 (operator B_i). *We set*

$$B_i(\lambda) = T_i + \frac{t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2}}{u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1}.$$

Note that for any $\lambda \in P$, the denominator is not zero. For simplicity, we write B_i when $B_i(\lambda)$ acts on E_λ .

$$\text{If } s_i \lambda \succ \lambda, \quad \text{then } B_i E_\lambda = t^{1/2} E_{s_i \lambda}.$$

$$\text{If } s_i \lambda = \lambda, \quad \text{then } B_i E_\lambda = 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } s_i \lambda \prec \lambda, \quad \text{then } B_i E_\lambda &= t^{-1/2} \\ &\times \frac{(t^{-1} u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1)(t u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1)}{(u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) - 1)^2} E_{s_i \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the group action generated by $\omega^{\pm 1}$ and s_i on P is transitive. Hence by applying the intertwiners A and B_i , we see that E_λ is a cyclic vector in U for any $\lambda \in P$. Namely, U is irreducible.

3. IRREDUCIBLE REPRESENTATION DEFINED BY WHEEL CONDITION

In this section, we impose the specialization of parameters (1). Namely, let k, r be integers with $n - 1 \geq k \geq 1$ and $r \geq 2$, and we specialize parameters $t^{k+1} q^{r-1} = 1$. To be precise, introduce a new parameter u and specialize $(t, q) = (u^{(r-1)/M}, \tau u^{-(k+1)/M})$. Here, M is the greatest common divisor of $(k+1, r-1)$ and $\tau = \exp(\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{r-1})$.

Take

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{K}' &= \{c \in \tilde{\mathbb{K}}; c \text{ is regular at } (1)\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_n' &= \{h \in \mathcal{H}_n; h \text{ is regular at } (1)\}, \\ U' &= \{f \in U; f \text{ is regular at } (1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $\mathbb{K}$, $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$ and V be the images of $\mathbb{K}'$, $\mathcal{H}_n'$, and U' by the specialization (1). Note that $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}(u)$ and $V = \mathbb{K}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_n^{\pm 1}]$.

In this situation, we construct an ideal of V defined by a certain vanishing condition. This gives an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$.

Definition 3.1. Define

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{(k,r)} &= \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n \ ; \ \text{there exist distinct } i_1, \dots, i_{k+1} \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\ &\quad \text{and positive integers } s_1, \dots, s_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ &\quad \text{such that } z_{i_{a+1}} = z_{i_a} t q^{s_a} \text{ for } 1 \leq a \leq k, \\ &\quad \sum_{a=1}^k s_a \leq r-2, \text{ and } i_a < i_{a+1} \text{ if } s_a = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the ideal

$$I^{(k,r)} = \{f \in V; f(z) = 0 \text{ for any } z \in Z^{(k,r)}\}.$$

We call the defining condition of $I^{(k,r)}$ the *wheel condition*.

Remark 3.2. Let us denote the relation $z_j = t q^s z_i$ by $z_i \xrightarrow{s} z_j$. Take an element $z \in Z^{(k,r)}$. Then there exist $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} z_{i_1} & \xrightarrow{s_1} & z_{i_2} & \xrightarrow{s_2} & \dots \\ \uparrow s_{k+1} & & & & \downarrow s_{k-1} \\ z_{i_{k+1}} & \xleftarrow{s_k} & & & z_{i_k} \end{array}.$$

Note that $s_{k+1} := r - 1 - \sum_{a=1}^k s_a \geq 1$, and the specialization $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$ implies that $z_{i_{k+1}} \xrightarrow{s_{k+1}} z_{i_1}$. It looks like a wheel. This is the reason why we call such a condition the *wheel* condition.

Remark 3.3. The wheel condition is originally appeared in [7] as a vanishing condition for symmetric polynomials on the set $Z_{sym}^{(k,r)} = \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n; \exists s_1, \dots, s_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ such that } z_{a+1} = z_a t q^{s_a} \text{ for } 1 \leq a \leq k, \sum_{a=1}^k s_a \leq r-1\}$. The set $Z_{sym}^{(k,r)}$ is apparently different from $Z^{(k,r)}$. However, for symmetric polynomials, the vanishing condition on $Z_{sym}^{(k,r)}$ is equivalent to that on $Z^{(k,r)}$.

Now we describe the first main statement.

Proposition 3.4. *The ideal $I^{(k,r)}$ is a representation of the algebra $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$.*

Before giving the proof, let us give equivalent definitions of the ideal $I^{(k,r)}$. We can reduce the set $Z^{(k,r)}$ to smaller subsets.

Definition 3.5. Let $\lambda \in P$. Suppose that $(u_\lambda(x_1), \dots, u_\lambda(x_n)) \in Z^{(k,r)}$. Then there exist $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ and $s_1, \dots, s_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u_\lambda(x_{i_{a+1}}) &= u_\lambda(x_{i_a}) t q^{s_a} \text{ for } 1 \leq a \leq k, \\ \sum_a s_a &\leq r-2, \text{ and } i_a < i_{a+1} \text{ if } s_a = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We call such $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ a *wheel* in λ . For some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+1}$, if $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ and $\sigma(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}) = (i_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma^{-1}(k+1)})$ are wheels in λ , we identify them. In such a case, we see that $\sigma(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}) = (i_a, i_{a+1}, \dots, i_{k+1}, i_1, \dots, i_{a-1})$ for some $1 \leq a \leq k+1$ by the definition of wheels. Denote the number of equivalent classes of wheels by $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$.

We shall introduce two subsets $S^{(k,r)}$ and $S'^{(k,r)}$ in P .

Definition 3.6. Let a, b be integers with $a \geq 2$ and $b \geq 1$. Take $\lambda \in P$. We call (i, j) is a *neighborhood of type (a, b)* in λ if (i) and (ii) hold:

- (i) $\rho(\lambda)_i - \rho(\lambda)_j = a - 1$,
- (ii) $(\lambda_i - \lambda_j \leq b - 1)$, or $(\lambda_i - \lambda_j = b \text{ and } j < i)$.

Definition 3.7. We define $S^{(k,r)} = \{\lambda \in P; \lambda \text{ has a neighborhood of type } (k+1, r-1)\}$ and $S'^{(k,r)} = \{\lambda \in S^{(k,r)}; \lambda \text{ has a neighborhood } (i, j) \text{ of type } (k+1, r-1) \text{ such that } \lambda_i - \lambda_j \leq r-2\}$.

Fix $\lambda \in S^{(k,r)}$ and let $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, 2, \dots, n)$.

Suppose that (i_l, i_{l+k}) is a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$ in λ . If $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+k}} \leq r-2$, then $(i_l, i_{l+1}, \dots, i_{l+k})$ is a wheel in λ . If $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+k}} = r-1$ and $i_{l+k} < i_l$, then $(i_{l+a}, \dots, i_{l+k}, i_l, \dots, i_{l+a-1})$ is a wheel in λ . Here, we take $a \geq 1$ satisfying $\lambda_{i_l} = \lambda_{i_{l+1}} = \dots = \lambda_{i_{l+a-1}} > \lambda_{i_{l+a}}$.

Suppose that (i_l, i_{l+k}) and (i_m, i_{m+k}) are different neighborhoods of type $(k+1, r-1)$ in λ (namely $l \neq m$). Consider the wheels in λ defined in the previous paragraph. Then we see that these wheels belong in different equivalent classes of wheels. Hence $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$ is greater than or equal to the number of neighborhoods of type $(k+1, r-1)$.

Example 3.8. ($n = 3, k = 1, r = 2$): The set $S^{(1,2)}$ and $S'^{(1,2)}$ are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(1,2)} = & \{(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_0, \lambda_1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \lambda_0), \\ & (\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_1 + 1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_0, \lambda_1 + 1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_0), \\ & ; \lambda_0, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \\ S'^{(1,2)} = & \{(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_0, \lambda_1), (\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \lambda_0), \\ & ; \lambda_0, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.9. Denote $\bar{0} = n$ and $\bar{i} = i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Then $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in λ if and only if $(\bar{i}_a - 1, \dots, \bar{i}_{k+1} - 1, \bar{i}_1 - 1, \dots, \bar{i}_{a-1} - 1)$ is a wheel in $\omega\lambda$ for some $1 \leq a \leq k + 1$. We also see that (i, j) is a neighborhood of type (a, b) in λ if and only if $(\bar{i} - 1, \bar{j} - 1)$ is a neighborhood of type (a, b) in $\omega\lambda$ for any $a \geq 2, b \geq 1$.

Lemma 3.10. *The ideal $I^{(k,r)}$ coincides with the following ideals:*

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \{f \in V; u_\lambda(f) = 0 \text{ for any } \lambda \in P \text{ satisfying } \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \geq 1\}, \\ J_2 &= \{f \in V; u_\lambda(f) = 0 \text{ for any } \lambda \in S^{(k,r)}\}, \\ J_3 &= \{f \in V; u_\lambda(f) = 0 \text{ for any } \lambda \in S'^{(k,r)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We see that $\{\lambda \in P; \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \geq 1\} \supset S^{(k,r)} \supset S'^{(k,r)}$. Hence $J_1 \subset J_2 \subset J_3$. If $f \in I^{(k,r)}$, then by the definition of $\sharp^{(k,r)}$, we see $f \in J_1$.

Let us show that $J_3 \subset I^{(k,r)}$. Fix an element $f = \sum_{\mu \in P} c_\mu x^\mu \in J_3$. Denote $\max\{|\mu_i|; c_\mu \neq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ by $\deg(f)$. and take an integer $N > 2(\deg(f) + 1)$. Let $M > 2N + 2[\frac{n}{k+1}](r - 1)$.

Take $\lambda^{(0)} \in S'^{(k,r)}$ satisfying the following condition:

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{for some } 1 \leq l \leq n - k, \\ & \lambda^{(0)} \text{ has a neighborhood } (i_l, i_{l+k}) \text{ of type } (k + 1, r - 1) \\ & \text{such that } \lambda_{i_l}^{(0)} - \lambda_{i_{l+k}}^{(0)} \leq r - 2, \text{ and } |\lambda_{i_l}^{(0)} - \lambda_{i_j}^{(0)}| > M \\ & \text{for any } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n \text{ except for } (i, j) = (i_a, i_b) \text{ } (l \leq a, b \leq l + k). \end{aligned}$$

Here we set $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_{\lambda^{(0)}} \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. We see that $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda^{(0)}) = 1$. Define a finite set

$$S(\lambda^{(0)}) = \{\lambda \in P; 0 \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(0)} \leq N \text{ for } i \neq i_l, i_{l+1}, \dots, i_{l+k}\}.$$

We see $S(\lambda^{(0)}) \subset S'^{(k,r)}$. Thus $u_\lambda(f) = 0$ for $\lambda \in S(\lambda^{(0)})$. Because f is a Laurent polynomial of $2\deg(f) \leq N$, we see that $f(z) = 0$ for any $z \in \mathbb{K}^n$ satisfying $z_{i_1} = u_{\lambda^{(0)}}(x_{i_1})$ and $z_{i_{a+1}} = tq^{\lambda_{i_a}^{(0)} - \lambda_{i_{a+1}}^{(0)}} z_{i_a}$ ($1 \leq a \leq k$).

Choose any $\lambda^{(0)}$ satisfying (4). Then by a similar argument, we see that $f(z) = 0$ for any $z \in Z^{(k,r)}$. Therefore $f \in I^{(k,r)}$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.4. We consider the actions of generators $T_i, X_j^{\pm 1}$ and $Y_j^{\pm 1}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n - 1, 1 \leq j \leq n$). By the definition, we see $X_i^{\pm 1} f = x_i^{\pm 1} f \in I^{(k,r)}$ for any $f \in I^{(k,r)}$. Since $Y_i^{\pm 1}$ is a linear combination of products of $\omega^{\pm 1}$ and T_i , it is sufficient to show that $\omega^{\pm 1} f$ and $T_i f \in I^{(k,r)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n - 1$) for any $f \in I^{(k,r)}$.

Fix an element $f \in I^{(k,r)}$. Similarly to Lemma 3.10, take an integer $N > 2(\deg(f) + 1)$ and let $M > 2N + 2\lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \rceil(r-1)$. Take $\lambda^{(0)} \in S'^{(k,r)}$ satisfying (4) and define a finite set

$$S(\lambda^{(0)}) = \{\lambda \in P; 0 \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(0)} \leq N \text{ for } i \neq i_l, \dots, i_{l+k}\}.$$

Let us show $u_\lambda(\omega^{\pm 1}f) = 0$ for any $\lambda \in S(\lambda^{(0)})$. By the definition of u_λ and ω , we see $u_\lambda(\omega^{\pm 1}f) = u_{\omega^{\pm 1}\lambda}(f)$. Since $\omega^{\pm 1}\lambda$ belongs to $S^{(k,r)}$ for any $\lambda \in S(\lambda^{(0)})$, we see $(u_{\omega^{\pm 1}\lambda}(x_1), \dots, u_{\omega^{\pm 1}\lambda}(x_n)) \in Z^{(k,r)}$. Hence we have $u_\lambda(\omega^{\pm 1}f) = 0$.

Let us show $u_\lambda(T_i f) = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$) for any $\lambda \in S(\lambda^{(0)})$. Recall $T_i = -\frac{t^{1/2}-t^{-1/2}}{x_i/x_{i+1}-1} + t^{-1/2}\frac{tx_i/x_{i+1}-1}{x_i/x_{i+1}-1}s_i$. Since $u_\lambda(f) = 0$, it is easy to see that

$$u_\lambda\left(-\frac{t^{1/2}-t^{-1/2}}{x_i/x_{i+1}-1}f\right) = 0.$$

Let us show that

$$(5) \quad u_\lambda\left(t^{-1/2}\frac{tx_i/x_{i+1}-1}{x_i/x_{i+1}-1}s_i f\right) = 0.$$

If $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1}$, then (5) holds because $u_\lambda(tx_i/x_{i+1}) = 1$. If $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_{i+1}$, then $s_i\lambda \in S'^{(k,r)}$. Therefore $u_\lambda(s_i f) = u_{s_i\lambda}(f) = 0$. Hence (5) is proved.

We have proved that $u_\lambda(\omega^{\pm 1}f) = u_\lambda(T_i f) = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$) for $\lambda \in S(\lambda^{(0)})$ and for any choice of $\lambda^{(0)} \in S'^{(k,r)}$ satisfying (4). Note that $2\deg(\omega f), 2\deg(T_i f) \leq N$. Hence from the same argument as Lemma 3.10, we see that $\omega^{\pm 1}f$ and $T_i f \in I^{(k,r)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$). Therefore the desired statement is proved. $\square$

Now we come to the main theorem of the paper. Set $B^{(k,r)} = P \setminus S^{(k,r)}$.

Theorem 3.11. *The ideal $I^{(k,r)}$ is irreducible. For any $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at the specialization (1). A basis of $I^{(k,r)}$ is given by $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in B^{(k,r)}\}$ specialized at (1).*

We give a proof of the theorem in the next section.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.11

We use the following notation for multiplicity of zeros and poles.

Definition 4.1. Let M be the greatest common divisor of $k+1$ and $r-1$. For $c \in \tilde{\mathbb{K}}$, denote by $\zeta(c)$ the integer satisfying

$$c = \left(t^{(k+1)/M}q^{(r-1)/M} - e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/M}\right)^{\zeta(c)} c'$$

where $c' \in \tilde{\mathbb{K}}$ have no zero or pole at (1).

Note that $\zeta(c)$ is the order of zeros or poles of c at the relevant irreducible component of $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$.

To prepare for the proof, we give a key lemma. This lemma claims that the changes of $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$ and $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda))$ when s_i acts on λ are related to the value of $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1})$.

Lemma 4.2 (Key Lemma). *Suppose $s_i\lambda \succ \lambda$.*

(i) *If $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda) < \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$, then $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$.*

If $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda) > \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$, then $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t$.

(ii) *We have $|\zeta(u_0(E_{s_i\lambda})) - \zeta(u_0(E_\lambda))| \leq 1$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1} &\Leftrightarrow \zeta(u_0(E_{s_i\lambda})) = \zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) + 1, \\ u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = 1 &\Leftrightarrow \zeta(u_0(E_{s_i\lambda})) = \zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.3. In fact, the converse statements for (i) are true. Here we omit them because we do not use them for the proof of Theorem 3.11.

Proof. (i). Fix $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^{k+1}$ (i_a are distinct).

Suppose $\{i, i+1\} \not\subset \{i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}\}$. Then, $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in λ if and only if $s_i(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in $s_i\lambda$.

Suppose $\{i, i+1\} \subset \{i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}\}$. (Case a) If $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in λ and $s_i(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is not a wheel in $s_i\lambda$, then by the definition of the wheel, $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1})$ must be equal to $u_\lambda(x_i) tq^0$. Thus $u_{s_i\lambda}(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$. (Case b) If $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is not a wheel in λ and $s_i(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in $s_i\lambda$, then by the same reason as (a), we see $u_{s_i\lambda}(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$. Note that $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = u_{s_i\lambda}(x_i/x_{i+1})^{-1}$. Hence if the case (a) (resp. (b)) occurs for $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$, then the case (a) (resp. (b)) does not occur for any other $(i'_1, \dots, i'_{k+1})$ such that $\{i, i+1\} \subset \{i'_1, \dots, i'_{k+1}\}$. Namely two cases (a) and (b) do not concur.

Hence, if $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda) < \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$, then the case (a) does occur and the case (b) does not occur. Thus $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$. If $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda) > \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda)$, then the case (b) does occur and the case (a) does not occur. Thus $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t$.

(ii). This is obvious from Lemma 2.4. $\square$

In the proof above, we see the following fact.

Remark 4.4. The relation $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) > \sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda)$ holds if and only if $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in λ and $s_i(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is not a wheel in $s_i\lambda$ for some $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$. Conversely, the relation $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) < \sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\lambda)$ holds if and only if $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is not a wheel in λ and $s_i(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$ is a wheel in $s_i\lambda$ for some $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1})$.

Definition 4.5. We introduce an equivalence relation "intertwined" generated by the following two relations:

(i) We call λ and $\omega\lambda$ are *intertwined*.

(ii) We call λ and $s_i\lambda$ for $s_i\lambda \neq \lambda$ are *intertwined* if $u_\lambda(x_i/x_{i+1}) \neq 1, t^{\pm 1}$.

From Lemma 2.3, Remark 3.9, and Key Lemma 4.2, if λ and λ' are intertwined, then we see that $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) = \zeta(u_0(E_{\lambda'}))$ and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) = \sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda')$. Moreover, if E_λ have no pole at (1), then by applying intertwiners A and B_i , we obtain $E_{\lambda'}$.

There is a connection between the number of neighborhoods of different types.

Lemma 4.6. *Take $\lambda \in P$ and let $a \geq 2$, $b \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, and $m \geq 1$.*

(i) *If there exists a neighborhood of type $(a+d, b)$ in λ , then there exist $d+1$ neighborhoods of type (a, b) in λ .*

(ii) *If there exists a neighborhood of type $(m(a-1)+1, mb)$ in λ , then there exists a neighborhood of type (a, b) in λ .*

Proof. Let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$.

(i). Suppose that $(i_l, i_{l+a+d-1})$ is a neighborhood of type $(a+d, b)$ in λ . Set $I_j := (i_j, i_{j+a-1})$ ($l \leq j \leq l+d$). If there exists j such that I_j is not a neighborhood of type (a, b) , then $\lambda_{i_j} - \lambda_{i_{j+a-1}} > b$ or $\lambda_{i_j} - \lambda_{i_{j+a-1}} = b$ and $i_j < i_{j+a-1}$. Thus, $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+a+d-1}} > b$ or $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+a+d-1}} = b$ and $i_l < i_{l+a+d-1}$. However this is inconsistent with the fact that $(i_l, i_{l+a+d-1})$ is a neighborhood of type $(a+d, b)$. Hence any I_j ($l \leq j \leq l+d$) is a neighborhood of type (a, b) .

(ii). Suppose that $(i_l, i_{l+m(a-1)})$ is a neighborhood of type $(m(a-1)+1, mb)$. Set $I_j := (i_{l+(j-1)(a-1)}, i_{l+j(a-1)})$ ($1 \leq j \leq m$). Assume that no pair I_j is a neighborhood of type (a, b) . Then for any $1 \leq j \leq m$, we see $\lambda_{i_{l+(j-1)(a-1)}} - \lambda_{i_{l+j(a-1)}} > b$ or $\lambda_{i_{l+(j-1)(a-1)}} - \lambda_{i_{l+j(a-1)}} = b$ and $i_{l+(j-1)(a-1)} < i_{l+j(a-1)}$. Hence $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+m(a-1)}} > mb$ or $\lambda_{i_l} - \lambda_{i_{l+m(a-1)}} = mb$ and $i_l < i_{l+m(a-1)}$. However this is inconsistent with the fact that $(i_l, i_{l+m(a-1)})$ is a neighborhood of type $(m(a-1)+1, mb)$. Therefore there exists at least one I_j which is a neighborhood of type (a, b) . $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *If λ has a neighborhood of type $(m(k+1), m(r-1))$, then λ has a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$.*

Let $d \geq 1$. If λ has a neighborhood of type $(m(k+1)+d, m(r-1))$, then λ has two neighborhoods of type $(k+1, r-1)$.

Proof. If λ has a neighborhood of type $(m(k+1), m(r-1))$, then from Lemma 4.6 (i), λ has a neighborhood of type $(mk+1, m(r-1))$. Thus from Lemma 4.6 (ii), λ has a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$.

If λ has a neighborhood of type $(m(k+1)+d, m(r-1))$, then from Lemma 4.6 (i), λ has a neighborhood of type $(m(k+1)+1, m(r-1))$. Thus from Lemma 4.6 (ii), λ has a neighborhood of type $(k+2, r-1)$. Therefore from Lemma 4.6 (i), λ has two neighborhoods of type $(k+1, r-1)$. $\square$

Let us show that any element in $B^{(k,r)}$ is intertwined with each other.

Definition 4.8. Take $\lambda \in P$ and let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. We call $\lambda' \in P$ an enlargement of λ if $\rho(\lambda) = \rho(\lambda')$ and $\lambda'_{i_a} - \lambda'_{i_{a+1}} > \max\{\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor (r-1), \lambda_{i_a} - \lambda_{i_{a+1}}\}$ for any $1 \leq a \leq n-1$.

Note that there always exists an enlargement λ' of λ . We see that $\lambda' \in B^{(k,r)}$ and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda') = 0$.

Let us make λ' from λ applying some s_i and ω .

Proposition 4.9 (enlarging procedure). *Take $\lambda \in P$ and its enlargement λ' . Then there exists a finite sequence $\lambda = \nu^{(0)}, \nu^{(1)}, \dots, \nu^{(N-1)}, \nu^{(N)} = \lambda'$ and (i), (ii), or (iii) holds for any $0 \leq a \leq N-1$:*

(i) $\nu^{(a+1)} = \omega^{\pm 1} \nu^{(a)}$,

(ii) $\nu^{(a+1)} = s_i \nu^{(a)}$ and $\nu^{(a+1)} \succ \nu^{(a)}$,

(iii) $\nu^{(a+1)} = s_i \nu^{(a)}$, $\nu^{(a+1)} \prec \nu^{(a)}$, and $\nu^{(a+1)}$ is intertwined with $\nu^{(a)}$.

We call this sequence the enlarging procedure.

Proof. Let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Set $M_i = \lambda'_i - \lambda_i$. Then $M_{i_a} - M_{i_n} \geq 0$ for any $1 \leq a \leq n$. Note that λ_{i_1} is the leftmost maximum component of λ .

Let $\Delta_{i_1} = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{n-1} \omega s_1 \cdots s_{i_1-1}$. Then $\Delta_{i_1} \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_1} + 1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\Delta_{i_1}^{M_{i_1}-M_{i_n}} \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_1} + M_{i_1} - M_{i_n}, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Note that for each step in $\lambda, s_{i_1-1} \lambda, \dots, \Delta_{i_1} \lambda, \dots, \Delta_{i_1}^{M_{i_1}-M_{i_n}} \lambda$, the case (i) or (ii) holds.

Next, set $\lambda^{(1)} = \Delta_{i_1}^{M_{i_1}-M_{i_n}} \lambda$ and apply $\Delta_{i_2}^{M_{i_2}-M_{i_n}}$ to $\lambda^{(1)}$. Then we obtain $\lambda^{(2)} = (\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{i_2}^{(1)} + M_{i_2} - M_{i_n}, \dots, \lambda_n^{(1)})$. Suppose that $s_i \nu$ and ν are serial elements satisfying $s_i \nu \prec \nu$ in the sequence $\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(2)}$. Then we see that $s_i \nu$ and ν are intertwined. In fact, by the definition of the procedure, we see $\nu_i - \nu_{i+1} > [\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1)$. Hence we have $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) \neq 1, t^{\pm 1}$. Therefore in such a case, (iii) holds.

Inductively, we obtain $\lambda^{(n-1)} = (\lambda'_1 - M_{i_n}, \dots, \lambda'_n - M_{i_n})$. Similarly, if $s_i \nu$ and ν are serial elements satisfying $s_i \nu \prec \nu$ in the sequence $\lambda, \dots, \lambda^{(n-1)}$, then $s_i \nu$ and ν are intertwined, and (iii) holds.

Finally, shift it by $\omega^{nM_{i_n}}$ and we obtain λ' . $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Take $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$ and its enlargement λ' . Then λ' is intertwined with λ .*

Proof. Consider the enlarging procedure $\lambda, \dots, \nu^{(a)}, \nu^{(a+1)} \dots, \lambda'$ given in previous proposition.

Let us show that $\nu^{(a+1)}$ is intertwined with $\nu^{(a)}$ by induction. In the case (i) and (iii), they are intertwined. Let us check for the case (ii). Set $\nu = \nu^{(a)}$ and suppose $s_i \nu \succ \nu$. By the hypothesis of induction, ν is intertwined with λ . Thus we see $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu) = 0$. Assume that $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^d$ for some $d = -1, 0, 1$. Then $(\rho(\nu)_{i+1} - \rho(\nu)_i, \nu_{i+1} - \nu_i) = (m(k+1) + d, m(r-1))$ for some $m \geq 1$. Thus ν has a neighborhood $(i+1, i)$ of type $(m(k+1) + d + 1, m(r-1))$. Hence from Lemma 4.7, ν has a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$. However it is inconsistent with $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu) = 0$. Therefore $s_i \nu$ and ν are intertwined. $\square$

Using this lemma, we have the following statement.

Lemma 4.11. *Any element in $B^{(k,r)}$ is intertwined with each other.*

Proof. Take $\lambda, \mu \in B^{(k,r)}$, and let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$ and $(j_1, \dots, j_n) = w_\mu \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Take $M > [\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1) + \sum_{a < b} (|\lambda_a - \lambda_b| + |\mu_a - \mu_b|)$. Then from Lemma 4.10, we obtain enlargements λ' and μ' such that $\lambda'_{i_a} = \mu'_{j_a} = nM - aM$, λ' is intertwined with λ , and μ' is intertwined with μ . Note that λ' is a permutation of μ' . Since $|\lambda'_i - \lambda'_j|$ and $|\mu'_i - \mu'_j| > [\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1)$ for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, we see that λ' and μ' are intertwined. Therefore λ and μ are intertwined. $\square$

The well-definedness of E_λ at (1) is shown by checking Y -eigenvalues:

Lemma 4.12. *Let $\lambda \in P$. If there does not exist $\mu \neq \lambda$ such that $t^{\rho(\lambda)} q^\lambda = t^{\rho(\mu)} q^\mu$ at (1), then E_λ has no pole at (1).*

Proof. Set $Y(w) = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i w^{i-1}$ and $\lambda(w) = \sum_{i=1}^n t^{\rho(\lambda)_i} q^{\lambda_i} w^{i-1}$. We see that

$$E_\lambda = \prod_{\mu \prec \lambda} \frac{Y(w) - \mu(w)}{\lambda(w) - \mu(w)} x^\lambda.$$

By the hypothesis, the right hand side does not have a pole at (1) for generic w . Hence E_λ has no pole at (1). $\square$

Lemma 4.13. *Let $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \leq 1$. Then there is no $\mu \in P$ such that $\mu \neq \lambda$ and $t^{\rho(\mu)} q^\mu = t^{\rho(\lambda)} q^\lambda$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists such an element $\mu \in P$. Let j_0 be such that $\rho(\lambda)_{j_0} = \max\{\rho(\lambda)_i ; \rho(\lambda)_i \neq \rho(\mu)_i\}$.

Let m_0, j_1 and m_1 be such that $\rho(\mu)_{j_0} = \rho(\lambda)_{j_0} - m_0(k+1)$, $\rho(\mu)_{j_1} = \rho(\mu)_{j_0} + (k+1)$, and $\rho(\mu)_{j_1} = \rho(\lambda)_{j_1} - m_1(k+1)$. Note that $m_0 \geq 1$ because of the definition of j_0 . Set $m_2 = \frac{\rho(\lambda)_{j_0} - \rho(\lambda)_{j_1}}{k+1}$. Note that $m_2 = m_0 - m_1 - 1 \geq 1$. In fact, if $m_1 \neq 0$, then by the definition of j_0 , we see that $m_2 \geq 1$. If $m_1 = 0$, then $m_2 \geq 0$. Since $j_0 \neq j_1$, we see $m_2 \neq 0$. Hence $m_2 \geq 1$.

Then we have $\lambda_{j_0} - \lambda_{j_1} \geq m_2(r-1)$. In fact, if $\lambda_{j_0} - \lambda_{j_1} < m_2(r-1)$, then (j_0, j_1) is a neighborhood of type $(m_2(k+1)+1, m_2(r-1))$ in λ . Thus from Lemma 4.7, we have $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \geq 2$ and this is inconsistent with $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \leq 1$.

Since $t^{\rho(\mu)} q^\mu = t^{\rho(\lambda)} q^\lambda$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{j_1} - \mu_{j_0} &= (\lambda_{j_1} - m_1(r-1)) - (\lambda_{j_0} - m_0(r-1)) \\ &= \lambda_{j_1} - \lambda_{j_0} + (-m_1 + m_0)(r-1) \\ &\leq (-m_2 - m_1 + m_0)(r-1) \\ &= r-1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, if the equality $\mu_{j_1} - \mu_{j_0} = r-1$ holds, then $\lambda_{j_0} - \lambda_{j_1} = m_2(r-1)$. Hence we see $j_0 < j_1$. In fact, if $j_0 > j_1$, then (j_0, j_1) is a neighborhood of type $(m_2(k+1)+1, m_2(r-1))$ in λ . Thus from Lemma 4.7, $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \geq 2$, and this is inconsistent with $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \leq 1$.

Hence μ has a neighborhood (j_1, j_0) of type $(k+2, r-1)$. From Lemma 4.7, $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\mu) \geq 2$. Because $t^{\rho(\mu)} q^\mu = t^{\rho(\lambda)} q^\lambda$, we see that λ also has two wheels. However this is inconsistent with the hypothesis $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) \leq 1$. $\square$

Lemma 4.14. *Let $\lambda = (0, M, 2M, \dots, (n-1)M)$ with $M > 2\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor(r-1)$. Note that $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$ and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda) = 0$. Then the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at (1) and we have $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) = \lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.12 and 4.13, we see that E_λ has no pole at (1).

Let us compute $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda))$. From Lemma 2.3 and 2.4, we obtain $u_0(E_\lambda)$ from $u_0(E_0) = 1$. Let us find factors of the form $(t^{m(k+1)}q^{m(r-1)} - 1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(E_{(0,0,\dots,0,0,(n-1)M})) &= u_0(E_{(0,0,\dots,0,0,0)})c_1 \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \prod_{j=n-1}^1 \frac{t^{j+1}q^i - 1}{t^j q^i - 1}, \\ u_0(E_{(0,0,\dots,0,(n-1)M,nM})) &= u_0(E_{(0,0,\dots,0,0,(n-1)M)})c_2 \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \prod_{j=n-2}^1 \frac{t^{j+1}q^i - 1}{t^j q^i - 1}, \\ &\dots, \\ u_0(E_{(0,M,2M,\dots,(n-1)M)}) &= u_0(E_{(0,0,2M,\dots,(n-1)M)})c_{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \prod_{j=1}^1 \frac{t^{j+1}q^i - 1}{t^j q^i - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, c_i is a factor which does not contain $(t^i q^N - 1)$ with $N < M$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(E_\lambda) &= u_0(E_{(0,M,2M,\dots,(n-1)M)}) \\ &= c \prod_{l=1}^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n-l} \frac{t^{j+1}q^i - 1}{t^j q^i - 1} \quad \text{where } c = \prod c_i, \\ &= c \prod_{l=1}^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \frac{t^{n-l+1}q^i - 1}{t q^i - 1} \\ &= c \prod_{l=2}^n \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} \frac{t^l q^i - 1}{t q^i - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the multiplicity of the factor $(t^{k+1}q^{r-1} - 1)$ is $[\frac{n}{k+1}]$. $\square$

Lemma 4.15. *For any $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at (1) and we have $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) = [\frac{n}{k+1}]$.*

Proof. This is clear from Lemma 4.11 and 4.14. $\square$

Lemma 4.16. *For $\mu \in P$, let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\mu \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Suppose that μ satisfies the following condition:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for some } 1 \leq l \leq n-k, \\ (6) \quad &\mu \text{ has a neighborhood } (i_l, i_{l+k}) \text{ of type } (k+1, r-1), \text{ and} \\ &|\mu_i - \mu_j| > 2[\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1) \\ &\text{for any } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n \text{ except for } (i, j) = (i_a, i_b) \text{ } (l \leq a, b \leq l+k). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\mu) = 1$.

Then, E_μ has no pole at (1) and $\zeta(u_0(E_\mu)) = [\frac{n}{k+1}] - 1$.

Proof. From Lemma 4.12 and 4.13, we see that E_μ has no pole at (1).

Let us compute $\zeta(u_0(E_\mu))$. Fix an enlargement μ' of μ , and consider the enlarging procedure. Note that $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\mu) = 1$ and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\mu') = 0$. Thus μ and μ' are not intertwined.

Suppose that ν and $s_i \nu$ are serial elements in the enlarging procedure such that μ and ν are intertwined and ν is not intertwined with $s_i \nu$. Then we see that

$\sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu) = 1$, $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^d$ for some $d = -1, 0, 1$, $s_i\nu \succ \nu$, and ν satisfies the condition (6) replaced by ν .

Let us show that $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$. Assume that $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^d$ for $d = 0, 1$. Then $(\rho(\nu)_{i+1} - \rho(\nu)_i, \nu_{i+1} - \nu_i) = (m(k+1) + d, m(r-1))$ for some $m \geq 1$. Thus ν has a neighborhood $(i+1, i)$ of type $(m(k+1) + d + 1, m(r-1))$, and from Lemma 4.7, ν has two neighborhoods of type $(k+1, r-1)$. However this is inconsistent with $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu) = 1$.

Let us show that $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\nu) < \sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu)$. We have shown that $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) = t^{-1}$. Then $(\rho(\nu)_{i+1} - \rho(\nu)_i, \nu_{i+1} - \nu_i) = (m(k+1) - 1, m(r-1))$ for some $m \geq 1$. Here we see $m = 1$. In fact, if $m \geq 2$, then from the relation $\nu_{i+1} - \nu_i = m(r-1)$ and (6), we see $m \geq 2\lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \rceil$. Hence $\rho(\nu)_{i+1} - \rho(\nu)_i \geq n$. However this is contradiction. Therefore ν has a neighborhood $(i+1, i)$ of type $(k+1, r-1)$ such that $\nu_{i+1} - \nu_i = r-1$. Let $(j_1, \dots, j_n) = w_\nu \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Then $j_l = i+1$ and $j_{l+k} = i$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-k$. We see that for some $l \leq a \leq l+k$, $J = (j_a, \dots, j_{l+k}, j_l, \dots, j_{a-1})$ is a wheel in ν . Moreover, by the definition of wheels, $s_i J$ is not a wheel in $s_i\nu$. Therefore from Remark 4.4, we have $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\nu) < \sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu)$.

Since $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\nu) = 1$, we obtain $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_i\nu) = 0$. Let us show that $s_i\nu$ and μ' are intertwined. Let ξ and $s_j\xi$ are any serial elements between $s_i\nu$ and μ' in the enlarging procedure. If $s_j\xi \prec \xi$, then ξ and $s_j\xi$ are intertwined. Suppose that $s_j\xi \succ \xi$ and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\xi) = 0$. Assume that $u_\xi(x_j/x_{j+1}) = t^d$ for some $d = -1, 0, 1$. Then $(\rho(\xi)_{j+1} - \rho(\xi)_j, \xi_{j+1} - \xi_j) = (m(k+1) + d, m(r-1))$ for some $m \geq 1$. Thus ξ has a neighborhood $(j+1, j)$ of type $(m(k+1) + d + 1, m(r-1))$, and from Lemma 4.7, ξ has a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$. However this is inconsistent with $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\xi) = 0$. Hence ξ and $s_j\xi$ are intertwined and $\sharp^{(k,r)}(s_j\xi) = 0$. Inductively, we obtain that $s_i\nu$ and μ' are intertwined.

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(u_0(E_\mu)) &= \zeta(u_0(E_\nu)) \\ &= \zeta(u_0(E_{s_i\nu})) - 1 \\ &= \zeta(u_0(E_{\mu'})) - 1 \\ &= \left\lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \right\rceil - 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we give a lower estimate of $I^{(k,r)}$.

Proposition 4.17. *For any $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at (1). Moreover, E_λ specialized at (1) belongs to $I^{(k,r)}$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$. Then from Lemma 4.15, the well-definedness of E_λ is proved and we have $\zeta(u_0(E_\lambda)) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \right\rceil$.

Let us show that $E_\lambda \in I^{(k,r)}$. Take $D > 2(\max_i \{|\lambda_i|\} + 1)$, $M > 2[\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1)$, and $N > 2M + 2D$. Take $\mu^{(0)} \in S'^{(k,r)}$ satisfying the following condition:

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{for some } 1 \leq l \leq n-k, \\ & \mu^{(0)} \text{ has a neighborhood } (i_l, i_{l+k}) \text{ of type } (k+1, r-1) \\ & \text{such that } \mu_{i_l}^{(0)} - \mu_{i_{l+k}}^{(0)} \leq r-2, \text{ and } |\mu_i^{(0)} - \mu_j^{(0)}| > M \\ & \text{for any } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n \text{ except for } (i, j) = (i_a, i_b) \text{ } (l \leq a, b \leq l+k). \end{aligned}$$

Here we set $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_{\mu^{(0)}} \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. We see $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\mu^{(0)}) = 1$. Define a finite set

$$S(\mu^{(0)}) = \{\mu \in P; 0 \leq \mu_i - \mu_i^{(0)} \leq D \text{ for } i \neq i_l, i_{l+1}, \dots, i_{l+k}\}.$$

Then from Lemma 4.16, for any $\mu \in S(\mu^{(0)})$, we see that E_μ has no pole at (1) and $\zeta(u_0(E_\mu)) = [\frac{n}{k+1}] - 1$. From the duality relation, we have

$$u_\mu(E_\lambda) = \frac{u_\lambda(E_\mu)}{u_0(E_\mu)} u_0(E_\lambda).$$

Hence we see that $\zeta(u_\mu(E_\lambda)) \geq 1$. Therefore, from the same argument as Lemma 3.10, we have that E_λ specialized at (1) belongs to $I^{(k,r)}$. $\square$

5. IRREDUCIBILITY OF $I^{(k,r)}$

In this section, we give an upper estimate of the character of $I^{(k,r)}$, and thereby, we show that $I^{(k,r)}$ is irreducible. Thus, we will complete the proof of Theorem 3.11.

First, we give an upper estimate of the character of $I^{(k,r)}$. Recall the definition of $I^{(k,r)}$:

$$I^{(k,r)} = \{f \in V; f(z) = 0 \text{ for any } z \in Z^{(k,r)}\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{(k,r)} &= \{z \in \mathbb{K}^n \quad ; \quad \exists i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}, \exists s_1, \dots, s_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ & \quad \text{such that } z_{i_{a+1}} = z_{i_a} t q^{s_a} \text{ for } 1 \leq a \leq k, \\ & \quad \sum_a s_a \leq r-2, \text{ and } i_a < i_{a+1} \text{ if } s_a = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the character of $I^{(k,r)}$ as follows. For any Laurent polynomial $f = \sum_\lambda c_\lambda x^\lambda$, we set $\deg(f) = \max\{|\lambda_i|; c_\lambda \neq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We introduce the filtration

$$V_{(d)} = \{f \in V; \deg(f) \leq d\},$$

and define $I_{(d)}^{(k,r)} = I^{(k,r)} \cap V_{(d)}$.

Let us take the limit $u \rightarrow 1$. Namely, take $V_{\text{reg}} = \{f \in V; f \text{ is regular at } u = 1\}$ and let V_0 be the image of V_{reg} by the specialization $u = 1$. Note that $V_0 = \mathbb{C}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_n^{\pm 1}]$. Then the ideal reduces to

$$I^{(k,r)'} = \{f \in V_0; f(z) = 0 \text{ for any } z \in Z^{(k,r)'}\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{(k,r)'} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n \quad ; \quad \exists j_1 < \cdots < j_{k+1}, \exists p_1, \cdots, p_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \exists w \in \mathbb{C} \\ \text{such that } z_{j_a} = \tau^{p_a} w \text{ for } 1 \leq a \leq k+1 \\ \text{and } 0 \leq p_a \leq r-2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The correspondence between $Z^{(k,r)}$ and $Z^{(k,r)'}$ is as follows. For $z \in Z^{(k,r)}$, we see that $z_{i_a} = z_{i_1} t^{a-1} q^{s_1 + \cdots + s_{a-1}}$. Thus for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+1}$ such that $i_{\sigma(1)} < \cdots < i_{\sigma(k+1)}$, we take $j_a = i_{\sigma(a)}$, $p_a = p_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} + s_1 + \cdots + s_{\sigma(a)-1}$, $p_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}$ and w satisfying $\tau^{p_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}} w = z_{i_1}$. We also introduce the filtration

$$(V_0)_{(d)} = \{f \in V_0; \deg(f) \leq d\},$$

and set $I_{(d)}^{(k,r)'} = I^{(k,r)'} \cap (V_0)_{(d)}$. Note that the character of the ideal does not decrease under this limit. Namely $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} I_{(d)}^{(k,r)} \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} I_{(d)}^{(k,r)'}$.

Fix an arbitrary non-negative integer $M \geq 0$ and let us estimate the dimension of $I_{(M)}^{(k,r)'}$. We set $I_M = I_{(M)}^{(k,r)'}$, $P_M = \{\lambda \in P; -M \leq \lambda_i \leq M\}$, $S_M^{(k,r)} = S^{(k,r)} \cap P_M$, and $B_M^{(k,r)} = B^{(k,r)} \cap P_M$. Consider the tensor algebra $T(\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e_d; -M \leq d \leq M\})$ and denote it by R_M . Denote its n -th tensor subspace by $R_{M,n}$. For simplicity, we write $e_{\lambda_1} \cdots e_{\lambda_n} = e_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{\lambda_n}$ and $e_{\lambda} = e_{\lambda_1} \cdots e_{\lambda_n}$. Define

$$e(w)_M = \sum_{-M \leq d \leq M} e_d w^d,$$

then

$$e(z_1)_M \cdots e(z_n)_M = \sum_{\lambda \in P_M} e_{\lambda} z^{\lambda}.$$

We introduce a non-degenerate pairing

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : R_{M,n} \times (V_0)_{(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

by $\langle e_{\lambda}, x^{\mu} \rangle = \delta_{\lambda, \mu}$. Then

$$\langle e(z_1)_M \cdots e(z_n)_M, f \rangle = f(z_1, \cdots, z_n)$$

for any $f \in (V_0)_{(M)}$. By this pairing, the ideal I_M is written as follows:

$$R_{M,n}/J_M \cong I_M.$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} J_M = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{e(z_1)_M \cdots e(\tau^{p_1} w)_M \cdots e(\tau^{p_{k+1}} w)_M \cdots e(z_n)_M; \\ i_1 < \cdots < i_{k+1}, 0 \leq p_i \leq r-2, w, z_i \in \mathbb{C}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us give a spanning set of the quotient space $R_{M,n}/J_M$.

Proposition 5.1. *A spanning set of $R_{M,n}/J_M$ is given by the quotient image of the set $\{e_{\lambda}; \lambda \in B_M^{(k,r)}\}$. In other words, in $R_{M,n}/J_M$, the image of e_{λ} ($\lambda \in S_M^{(k,r)}$) is written as a linear combination of the image of e_{μ} ($\mu \in B_M^{(k,r)}$).*

Proof. First we calculate elements of J_M . We define some notations.

$$\mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1} = \{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1}; 0 \leq \eta_i \leq r-2 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k+1\}.$$

For $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1}$ and an integer $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$S(\eta, d) = \{\eta' \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1}; \sum_i \eta_i = d, \eta'_i = \eta_i \bmod r-1\}.$$

Fix $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_{k+1} \leq n$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & e(z_1) \dots e(\tau^{p_1} w) \dots e(\tau^{p_{k+1}} w) \dots e(z_n) \\ &= \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n} e_\nu \tau^{p_1 \nu_{j_1} + \dots + p_{k+1} \nu_{j_{k+1}}} w^{\nu_{j_1} + \dots + \nu_{j_{k+1}}} z_1^{\nu_1} \dots \widehat{z_{j_1}^{\nu_{j_1}}} \dots \widehat{z_{j_{k+1}}^{\nu_{j_{k+1}}}} \dots z_n^{\nu_n} \\ &= \sum_{\eta, d, \hat{\nu}} r_{(j_a), \eta, d, \hat{\nu}} \tau^{\sum_{a=1}^{k+1} p_a \eta_a} w^d z_1^{\nu_1} \dots \widehat{z_{j_1}^{\nu_{j_1}}} \dots \widehat{z_{j_{k+1}}^{\nu_{j_{k+1}}}} \dots z_n^{\nu_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last sum runs over $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1}$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\hat{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \widehat{\nu_{j_1}}, \dots, \widehat{\nu_{j_{k+1}}}, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k-1}$, and $r_{(j_a), \eta, d, \hat{\nu}}$ is given by

$$r_{(j_a), \eta, d, \hat{\nu}} = \sum_{\lambda} e_{\lambda}.$$

The sum runs over $\lambda \in P_M$ such that $(\lambda_{j_1}, \dots, \lambda_{j_{k+1}}) \in S(\eta, d)$ and $\lambda_i = \nu_i$ for $i \neq j_1, \dots, j_{k+1}$.

Hence in $R_{M,n}/J_M$,

$$0 = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1}} r_{(j_a), \eta, d, \hat{\nu}} \tau^{\sum_{a=1}^{k+1} p_a \eta_a}$$

for any $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\hat{\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k-1}$. Since this equality holds for any $0 \leq p_1, \dots, p_{k+1} \leq r-2$, we have

$$r_{(j_a), \eta, d, \hat{\nu}} = 0$$

for any $j_1 < \dots < j_{k+1}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1}$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\hat{\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k-1}$.

Let us introduce the total ordering on P . For $\lambda, \mu \in P$, let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_{\lambda}(1, \dots, n)$ and $(j_1, \dots, j_n) = w_{\mu}(1, \dots, n)$. We define $\lambda >' \mu$ if there exists $1 \leq l \leq n$ such that $\lambda_{i_a} = \mu_{j_a}$ and $i_a = j_a$ for any $1 \leq a \leq l-1$, and $\lambda_{i_l} > \mu_{j_l}$, or $\lambda_{i_l} = \mu_{j_l}$ and $i_l < j_l$. We induce the ordering to monomials. Namely, we define $e_{\lambda} >' e_{\mu}$ if $\lambda >' \mu$.

Suppose $\lambda \in S_M^{(k,r)}$. Let us rewrite e_{λ} in $R_{M,n}/J_M$ as a linear combination of greater monomials with respect to $>'$. Let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_{\lambda} \cdot (1, \dots, n)$ and (i_l, i_{l+k}) be a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$ in λ . Take $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+1}$ such that $i_{\sigma(l)} < i_{\sigma(l+1)} < \dots < i_{\sigma(l+k)}$ and let $\lambda' = (\lambda_{\sigma(i_l)}, \lambda_{\sigma(i_{l+1})}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(i_{l+k})})$. Take $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{r-1}^{k+1}$ satisfying $\eta_i \equiv \lambda'_i \bmod r-1$, and let $d = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \lambda'_i$. Then for any $\eta' \in S(\eta, d)$ such that $\eta' \neq \lambda'$, we have $\eta' >' \lambda'$. Hence we have

$$0 = r_{(\sigma(i_a)), \eta, d, \hat{\lambda}} = e_{\lambda} + \sum_{\mu} e_{\mu}.$$

The last sum runs over $\mu \in P_M$ such that $\mu >' \lambda$, $(\mu_{\sigma(i_1)}, \dots, \mu_{\sigma(i_{k+1})}) \in S(\eta, d)$ and $\mu_i = \lambda_i$ for $i \neq i_l, \dots, i_{l+k}$.

Continue this procedure. Because the set P_M is finite, the procedure stops in finite times. Therefore for any $\lambda \in S_M^{(k,r)}$, we can rewrite e_λ as a linear combination of e_μ ($\mu \in B_M^{(k,r)}$). $\square$

As a corollary, we obtain an upper estimate of the character of $I^{(k,r)}$.

Corollary 5.2. *For any $M \geq 0$, there exists a spanning set of $I_M^{(k,r)}$ which is labeled by $B_M^{(k,r)}$.*

Since the upper and the lower estimates coincide, $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in B^{(k,r)}\}$ is a basis of $I^{(k,r)}$. Now we are going to finish the proof of Theorem 3.11.

End of the proof of Theorem 3.11. Let us show that any non-zero element $v \in I^{(k,r)}$ is cyclic. From Lemma 4.13, all Y -eigenvalues in $I^{(k,r)}$ are different. Thus a certain E_λ ($\lambda \in B^{(k,r)}$) is contained in $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)} v$. Take another $\mu \in B^{(k,r)}$. Then μ is intertwined with λ from Lemma 4.11. Hence by applying intertwiners A and B_i on E_λ , the vector E_μ is also contained in $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)} v$. Since $\{E_\mu; \mu \in B^{(k,r)}\}$ is a basis of $I^{(k,r)}$, we obtain that v is cyclic. $\square$

6. A SERIES OF SUBREPRESENTATIONS DEFINED BY MULTI-WHEEL CONDITION

In this section, we construct a series of subrepresentations of $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$, in which $I^{(k,r)}$ appears as its member.

Definition 6.1. Define

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m^{(k,r)} = \{z \in \mathbb{K}^n; \quad & \text{there exist } 1 \leq i_{l,a} \leq n \text{ and } s_{l,a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ & \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq m \text{ and } 1 \leq a \leq k+1 \text{ such that} \\ & i_{l,a} \text{ are distinct, } z_{i_{l,a+1}} = z_{i_{l,a}} t q^{s_{l,a}}, \\ & \sum_{a=1}^k s_{l,a} \leq r-2, \text{ and } i_{l,a+1} < i_{l,a} \text{ if } s_{l,a} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the ideal

$$I_m^{(k,r)} = \{f \in V; f(z) = 0 \text{ for any } z \in Z_m^{(k,r)}\}.$$

We call the defining condition of $I_m^{(k,r)}$ the *multi-wheel condition*.

By the definition, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(k,r)} &= I_1^{(k,r)} \subset I_2^{(k,r)} \subset I_3^{(k,r)} \subset \dots \\ \dots &\subset I_{m_0}^{(k,r)} \subset I_{m_0+1}^{(k,r)} = I_{m_0+2}^{(k,r)} = \dots = V \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 = \lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor$.

Similarly to the single wheel case, we have an alternative definition of $I_m^{(k,r)}$.

Take $\lambda \in P$ and let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. We say that *neighborhoods* (i_l, i_{l+k}) and $(i_{l'}, i_{l'+k})$ are *distinct* if $\{i_l, i_{l+1}, \dots, i_{l+k}\}$ and $\{i_{l'}, i_{l'+1}, \dots, i_{l'+k}\}$ are disjoint.

Proposition 6.2. *Define the set $S_m^{(k,r)} = \{\lambda \in P; \lambda \text{ has distinct } m \text{ neighborhoods of type } (k+1, r-1)\}$. Then the ideal $I_m^{(k,r)}$ coincides with*

$$\{f \in V; u_\lambda(f) = 0 \text{ for any } \lambda \in S_m^{(k,r)}\}.$$

Proof. It is proved in the same way as the single wheel case. $\square$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *The ideal $I_m^{(k,r)}$ is a representation of $\mathcal{H}_n^{(k,r)}$.*

Proof. Similarly to the single wheel case, it is sufficient to show that $\omega^{\pm 1}f, T_i f \in I_m^{(k,r)}$.

Take an element $f \in I_m^{(k,r)}$ and an integer $N > 2(\deg(f) + 1)$. Let $M > 2N + 2[\frac{n}{k+1}](r-1)$.

Take $\lambda^{(0)} \in S_m^{(k,r)}$ satisfying that $(i_{l,1}, i_{l,k+1})$ is a neighborhood of type $(k+1, r-1)$ for $1 \leq l \leq m$, and $|\lambda_i^{(0)} - \lambda_j^{(0)}| > M$ for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ except for $(i, j) = (i_{l,a}, i_{l,b})$ ($1 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq a, b \leq k+1$). Note that $\sharp^{(k,r)}(\lambda^{(0)}) = m$. Define a finite set

$$S_m(\lambda^{(0)}) = \{\lambda \in P; 0 \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(0)} \leq N \text{ for } i \neq i_{l,a} \ (1 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq a \leq k+1)\}.$$

Note that $S_m(\lambda^{(0)}) \subset S_m^{(k,r)}$.

Then, similarly to the single wheel case, we can show that $u_\lambda(\omega^{\pm 1}f) = u_\lambda(T_i f) = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$) for any $\lambda \in S_m(\lambda^{(0)})$, and we see $\omega^{\pm 1}f, T_i f \in I_m^{(k,r)}$. $\square$

Conjecture 6.4. *The quotient representations $I_m^{(k,r)}/I_{m-1}^{(k,r)}$ are irreducible.*

We have the following statement in the case $n = k+1$.

Theorem 6.5. *The quotient representation $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ is irreducible. For any $\lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}$, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial E_λ has no pole at (1) . A basis of $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ is given by $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}\}$ specialized at (1) .*

Proof. In the case $n = k+1$, by the definition of wheels, we see that $\sharp^{(n-1,r)}(\lambda) \leq 1$ for any $\lambda \in P$. Hence from Lemma 4.12 and 4.13, E_λ has no pole at (1) for any $\lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}$.

Since the basis of $I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ is given by $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in B^{(n-1,r)}\}$ specialized at (1) , we see that the basis of $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ is given by $\{E_\lambda; \lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}\}$.

Let us show that $(0, \dots, 0) \in S^{(n-1,r)}$ is intertwined with any $\lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}$. Fix $\lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}$ and let $(i_1, \dots, i_n) = w_\lambda \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Then $\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{i_n} \leq r-2$, or $\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{i_n} = r-2$ and $i_n < i_1$.

Suppose that $\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{i_n} \leq r-2$. Set $\Delta_i = s_i \cdots s_{n-1} \omega s_1 \cdots s_{i-1}$. Then λ is obtained by

$$\omega^{n\lambda_{i_n}} \Delta_{i_{n-1}}^{(\lambda_{i_{n-1}} - \lambda_{i_n})} \cdots \Delta_{i_1}^{(\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{i_n})} \cdot (0, \dots, 0).$$

Note that for any serial elements ν and $s_i \nu$ in the sequence $(0, \dots, 0), \dots, \lambda$, we see that $\max_{j \neq j'} \{|\nu_j - \nu'_{j'}|\} \leq r-2$. Hence $u_\nu(x_i/x_{i+1}) \neq 1, t^{\pm 1}$, and ν is intertwined with $s_i \nu$. Therefore λ is intertwined with $(0, \dots, 0)$.

Suppose that $\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{i_n} = r-1$ and $i_n < i_1$. Then by applying ω for some times, we obtain λ' such that $\lambda'_{j_1} - \lambda'_{j_n} \leq r-2$. Here we use $(j_1, \dots, j_n) = w_{\lambda'} \cdot (1, \dots, n)$. Hence λ is intertwined with $(0, \dots, 0)$.

Therefore, from the definition of "intertwined", we see that E_λ is a cyclic vector of $V/I_1^{(n-1,r)}$ for any $\lambda \in S^{(n-1,r)}$. $\square$

Combining this theorem and Theorem 3.11, we see that the conjecture is true in the case $n = k + 1$.

Although we do not give a proof here, we can show that $I_2^{(1,r)}/I_1^{(1,r)}$ is irreducible and it is not Y -semisimple. We can also construct an explicit basis of $I_2^{(1,r)}$ in terms of a linear combination of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials specialized at (1).

REFERENCES

- [1] Ivan Cherednik, Double affine Hecke algebras, Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations, and Macdonald's operators, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1992, no. 9, 171–180.
- [2] Ivan Cherednik, Double affine Hecke algebras and Macdonald's conjectures, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 141 (1995), no. 1, 191–216.
- [3] Ivan Cherednik, Macdonald's evaluation conjectures and difference Fourier transform, *Invent. Math.* 122 (1995), no. 1, 119–145.
- [4] Ivan Cherednik, Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1995, no. 10, 483–515.
- [5] Ivan Cherednik, Double Affine Hecke Algebras and Difference Fourier Transforms, *Invent. Math.* 152 (2003), no. 2, 213–303.
- [6] Ivan Cherednik, Irreducibility of Perfect Representations of Double Affine Hecke Algebras, *math.QA/0406317*.
- [7] B. Feigin, M. Jimbo, T. Miwa, E. Mukhin, Symmetric polynomials vanishing on the shifted diagonals and Macdonald polynomials, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2003, no. 18, 1015–1034.
- [8] Masahiro Kasatani, Zeros of Symmetric Laurent Polynomials of Type $(BC)_n$ and Koornwinder-Macdonald Polynomials Specialized at $t^{k+1}q^{r-1} = 1$ *math.QA/0312327*.
- [9] M. Kasatani, T. Miwa, A. N. Sergeev, A. P. Veselov, Coincident root loci and Jack and Macdonald polynomials for special values of the parameters, *math.QA/0404079*.
- [10] Friedrich Knop, Integrality of two variable Kostka functions, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 482 (1997), 177–189. *q-alg/9603027*.
- [11] K. Mimachi, M. Noumi, A reproducing kernel for nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials, *Duke Math. J.* 91 (1998), no. 3, 621–634.
- [12] Siddhartha Sahi, Nonsymmetric Koornwinder polynomials and duality, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 150 (1999), no. 1, 267–282.
- [13] Jasper V. Stokman, Koornwinder polynomials and affine Hecke algebras, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 2000, no. 19, 1005–1042.
- [14] Takeshi Suzuki, Classification of simple modules over degenerate double Affine Hecke algebras of type A, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2003, no. 43, 2313–2339.
- [15] Eric Vasserot, Induced and simple modules of double affine Hecke algebras, *math.RT/0207127*.

E-mail address: `kasatani@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN